arXiv:1612.00917v2 [math.PR] 20 Feb 2017

Average Entropy of the Ranges for Simple Random Walks on Discrete Groups

Xin-Xing Chen[1,4] Jian-Sheng Xie[2,4] Min-Zhi Zhao[3,4]

1. School of Mathematical Sciences, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai 200240, China,

E-mail: chenxinx@sjtu.edu.cn

2. School of Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China,

E-mail:jsxie@fudan.edu.cn

3. School of Mathematical Sciences, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, China,

E-mail:zhaomz@zju.edu.cn

4. Shanghai Center of Mathematics, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China.

Abstract

Inspired by Benjamini et al (Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Stat. 2010) and Windisch (Electron. J. Probab. 2010), we consider the entropy of the random walk range formed by a simple random walk on a discrete group. It is shown in this setting the existence of a quantity which we call the average entropy of the ranges. Some equivalent conditions for the vanishing of the average entropy of the ranges are given. Particularly, the average entropy of the ranges vanishes if and only if the random walk is recurrent or escaping to negative infinity without left jump. In order to characterize the recurrence further, we study the average entropy of the weighted digraphs formed by the random walk. We show that the random walk is recurrent if and only if the average entropy of the weighted digraphs vanishes.

Keywords: random walk, entropy, range, recurrent

AMS 2000 subject classifications: 60G50,60J10,05C25

1 Introduction

Let R_n be the random walk range formed by the first n steps of a random walk. The study of R_n seems to be initiated by Dvoretzky and Erdös [8], where they established strong law of large numbers for the size of the random walk range (i.e. $|R_n|$) in lattice cases $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with $d \geq 2$. Probabilistic scientists also found that such quantity satisfies the central limit theorems [11] [13] [14] [17] and laws of iterated logarithm [1] [12]. Many other quantities about the structure of R_n, e.g. the radius of the largest covered ball, were discussed in Erdös and Taylor [9, 10] and Révész [19]. Recently, Benjamini et al [3] and Windisch [24] discussed the order of $H(R_n)$, the entropy of random walk range for lattice cases and graph cases (with the symmetrical distributions) respectively. It is natural to ask what happens for the general case of simple random walks on discrete groups.

Inspired by their works, and bearing in mind the question above, we continue to research on the entropy of random walk range for a simple random walk on a discrete group. In this setting we find that the limit $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \frac{H(R_n)}{n}$ always exists (which may be known to the authors of [3, 24]) and we will call it the average entropy of the ranges. Furthermore, we give different equivalent conditions for the average entropy attaining its critical values (the possible minimum value 0 and the possible maximum value). In the meanwhile we also relate the tail σ algebra with the vanishing of the average entropy of the ranges following a work of Kaĭmanovich and Vershik [15]. An important consequence is that, when $0 < H(R_1) < \infty$, the random walk is recurrent if and only if the tail σ-algebra of R_n is trivial. As is seen, the vanishing of the so-called average entropy of the random walk ranges cannot be used to characterize recurrent property which leads us to consider the average entropy of the weighted digraphs for random walks.

2 Settings and Main Results

Let G be a countable group with the identity element e. Let μ be a probability measure on G such that G is generated by the support of μ. Let $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ be the respective infinite product space, i.e., $\Omega = G^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathbb{P} = \mu^{\mathbb{N}}$. Let θ be the natural time shift map on Ω, i.e.,

$$\theta((\omega_1, \omega_2, \cdots)) = (\omega_2, \omega_3, \cdots).$$

Then the system $(\Omega, \mathbb{P}; \theta)$ is measure-preserving and ergodic. Next, we will define a random walk. For $n \geq 1$ and $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \cdots) \in \Omega$, set $X_n(\omega) = \omega_n$. Then $X_1, X_2, \cdots$ are independent and have the common law μ. Let $S_0 = e$, and set

$$S_n = S_{n-1} X_n \text{ for } n \geq 1.$$

Then $S = (S_0, S_1, S_2, \cdots)$ is a simple random walk on G which is called a $(G, \mu)-$random walk throughout this paper.

Let $R_n = \{g \in G : \exists 0 \leq i \leq n, S_i = g\}$, the range of S until time n. Let $\Gamma_n = (R_n, \overrightarrow{E}_n, W_n)$ be the random weighted digraph generated by the first n step, where

$$\overrightarrow{E}_n = \{(x, y) : \exists i < n, S_i = x, S_{i+1} = y\}$$

and

$$W_n(\overrightarrow{a}) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1_{\{S_i = x, S_{i+1} = y\}} \quad \text{for } \overrightarrow{a} = (x, y) \in \overrightarrow{E}_n.$$

So the weight function $W_n(\overrightarrow{a})$ records the number of jumps passing through the edge $\overrightarrow{a}$ before time n.

As usual, we write $H(Y)$ for the entropy of a discrete random element Y, that is

$$H(Y) = -\sum_y \mathbb{P}(Y = y) \ln \mathbb{P}(Y = y)$$

with usual convention $0 \ln 0 = 0$; it is called Shannon entropy with reference to Shannon's work [21]. In this paper we discuss mainly on the limits of $\frac{H(R_n)}{n}$ and $\frac{H(\Gamma_n)}{n}$. To avoid

triviality, we assume $0 < H(X_1) < \infty$ further. For each $A \subset G$ and $x \in G$, we set

$$p_n(A) = \mathbb{P}(R_n = A) \qquad \text{and} \qquad q_n(A, x) = \mathbb{P}(R_n = A, S_n = x). \tag{2.1}$$

Then we have our first result.

Theorem 2.1 *There is a constant $0 \le h \le H(X_1)$ such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{H(R_n)}{n} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{H(R_n, S_n)}{n} = h \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{-\ln p_n(R_n)}{n} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{-\ln q_n(R_n, S_n)}{n} = h \ \ a.s. \tag{2.3}$$

The above statements (2.2) and (2.3) also hold when R_n is replaced by Γ_n, while the constant h may be different.

Write $h_R(\mu) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{H(R_n)}{n}$ and call it the average entropy of the range of a (G, μ)-random walk. Similarly, write $h_\Gamma(\mu) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{H(\Gamma_n)}{n}$ and call it the average entropy of the traces. See, e.g., [20] [4] [5] [23] [22] for related studies on random walk traces.

The average entropies have close relations with tail σ-algebras. Write $R_\infty = \cup_n R_n$, and put

$$\mathcal{G}_n := \sigma(R_k, S_k : k \ge n), \quad \mathcal{G}_\infty := \bigcap_{n\ge 0} \mathcal{G}_n. \tag{2.4}$$

In other words, $\mathcal{G}_\infty$ is the tail σ-algebra of (R_n, S_n). A well known result (see [15] or [2, Chap. 12]) indicates the existence of the limit $h_S(\mu) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(S_n)$ and

$$h_S(\mu) = \frac{1}{k}[H(X_1, \cdots, X_k) - H(X_1, \cdots, X_k | \mathcal{S}_\infty)], \quad \forall k \ge 1, \tag{2.5}$$

where $\mathcal{S}_\infty$ is the tail σ-algebra of S_n. In a similar spirit, we have the following formula for $h_R(\mu)$.

Theorem 2.2 *For any $k \ge 1$,*

$$h_R(\mu) = \frac{1}{k}[H(X_1, \cdots, X_k) - H(X_1, \cdots, X_k, R_\infty \circ \theta^k \mid \mathcal{G}_\infty)]. \tag{2.6}$$

It is well known that (see [2, Chap. 12]) $h_S(\mu) = 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{S}_\infty$ is trivial. Inspired by this fact, we would go further to find out equivalent conditions for the vanishing of the average entropy of the range $h_R(\mu)$. As we know, the symmetric simple random walk on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with $d \leq 2$ is recurrent and $R_\infty = \mathbb{Z}^d$ almost surely. A result in [3] tells us $H(R_n) = O(\log n)$ for $d = 1$ and $H(R_n) = O(\frac{n}{\log n})$ for $d = 2$; Thus the average entropies of the ranges in these two cases are zero. It turns out that recurrent random walks always make $h_R(\mu)$ vanish; but still there is another special type of transient random walks bearing this property. To state this result in the simplest form, we need more notations. Set

$$L_\mu = \{a \in G : \mathrm{supp}(\mu) = \{a^{-1}, e, a, a^2, \cdots\} \text{ and } \sum_{i \geq -1} i\mu(\{a^i\}) < 0\}.$$

If $L_\mu \neq \emptyset$, then G is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$. So we may call such S *a random walk escaping to* $-\infty$ *without left jump* if $L_\mu \neq \emptyset$; clearly such a random walk is transient.

Theorem 2.3 *The following four statements are equivalent:*

(1) $h_R(\mu) = 0$*;*

(2) $\mathbb{P}(\exists n \geq 1,\ S_n = x) = 1$ *for some* $x \in G$*;*

(3) S *is either recurrent or a random walk escaping to* $-\infty$ *without left jump;*

(4) $H(R_\infty \circ \theta | R_\infty) = H(R_\infty | R_\infty \circ \theta)$ *and* $\mathcal{G}_\infty \equiv \sigma(R_\infty) \mod \mathbb{P}$.

We see that the vanishing of $h_R(\mu)$ can not characterize the recurrence. Luckily, the following theorem tells us that the vanishing of $h_\Gamma(\mu) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{H(\Gamma_n)}{n}$ can serve this role.

Theorem 2.4 *Process* S *is recurrent if and only if* $h_\Gamma(\mu) = 0$.

Similar as the proof of case 1 of Theorem 6.7.3 in [7], we can show that the tail σ-algebra of (Γ_n, S_n) is trivial when S is recurrent. In view of the formula (2.6) and Theorem 2.3, it is easy to see that the random walk is recurrent if and only if the σ-algebra $\mathcal{G}_\infty$

is trivial, which is also equivalent to the triviality of the tail σ-algebra of (Γ_n, S_n). This justifies the significance of the current research.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The proofs of Theorems 2.1–2.4 are presented in Sections 3–6 separately. In section 7, some related results are presented. We show that $h_R(\mu) = H(X_1)$ if and only if the escape rate of S is 1. We also show that $H(R_\infty) < \infty \Leftrightarrow \mathbb{E}[|X_1| \ln |X_1|] < \infty$ for any $(\mathbb{Z}, \mu)-$random walk escaping to $-\infty$ without left jump.

3 Proof of Theorem 2.1

Before the proof of Theorem 2.1, we show the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1 *Suppose $p_1 + p_2 + \cdots p_n = 1$ with $p_i > 0$ for all i. Then for any $\alpha \geq 1$,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \ln^\alpha(1/p_i) \leq (\alpha \vee \ln n)^\alpha + (\alpha - 1)^\alpha.$$

Proof. Let $f(x) = x \ln^\alpha(1/x)$. One can easily check that $f'' \leq 0$ on $(0, e^{1-\alpha}]$. So

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \ln^\alpha(1/p_i) \leq & (\alpha-1)^\alpha \sum_{p_i \geq e^{1-\alpha}} p_i + \sum_{p_i < e^{1-\alpha}} p_i \ln^\alpha(1/p_i) \\
\leq & (\alpha-1)^\alpha + \left(\sum_{p_i < e^{1-\alpha}} p_i \right) \ln^\alpha \left(\frac{|\{i \leq n : p_i < e^{1-\alpha}\}|}{\sum_{p_i < e^{1-\alpha}} p_i} \right) \\
\leq & (\alpha-1)^\alpha + \max_{x \in (0,1]} x \ln^\alpha(\tfrac{n \vee e^\alpha}{x}).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $x \ln^\alpha(\frac{n \vee e^\alpha}{x})$ is increasing on (0,1], we finish the proof of the lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Note that for any $A, B \subset G$ and $x, y \in G$, if $(R_n, S_n) = (A, x)$ and $(R_m, S_m) \circ \theta^n = (B, y)$ then

$$(R_{n+m}, S_{n+m}) = (A \cup (x \cdot B),\ x \cdot y).$$

By the Markov property,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(R_{n+m} = A \cup (x \cdot B),\ S_{n+m} = x \cdot y) \geq & \mathbb{P}(R_n = A, S_n = x, R_m \circ \theta^n = B, S_m \circ \theta^n = y) \\ \geq & \mathbb{P}(R_n = A, S_n = x)\mathbb{P}(R_m \circ \theta^n = B, S_m \circ \theta^n = y).\end{aligned}$$

Recall the definition of q_n in (2.1). Then the above inequality can be rewritten as

$$-\ln q_{n+m}(R_{n+m}, S_{n+m}) \leq -\ln q_n(R_n, S_n) - \ln q_m(R_m, S_m) \circ \theta^n. \tag{3.1}$$

Since $(R_m, S_m) \circ \theta^n$ has the same distribution with (R_m, S_m), we take expectation on both sides of (3.1) and get

$$H(R_{n+m}, S_{n+m}) \leq H(R_n, S_n) + H(R_m, S_m).$$

Furthermore, since

$$H(R_n, S_n) \leq H(X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_n) \leq nH(X_1) < \infty,$$

we can apply the Subadditive Ergodic Theorem of Kingman (see, e.g., [16] [6] [18]) yielding that there exists $0 \leq h \leq H(X_1)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{H(R_n, S_n)}{n} = \inf_n \frac{H(R_n, S_n)}{n} = h \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{-\ln q_n(R_n, S_n)}{n} = h \ \ a.s. \tag{3.3}$$

Moreover, since $H(R_n) \leq H(R_n, S_n) = H(R_n) + H(S_n|R_n) \leq H(R_n) + \ln(n+1)$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{H(R_n)}{n} = h.$$

Next we shall prove $\lim_{n\to\infty} -\frac{\ln p_n(R_n)}{n} = h \quad a.s.$. For $x \in A \subset G$, set

$$p_n(x|A) := \mathbb{P}(S_n = x | R_n = A).$$

Then $q_n(R_n, S_n) = p_n(R_n)p_n(S_n|R_n)$. By (3.3), it is suffice to prove

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{-\ln p_n(S_n|R_n)}{n} = 0 \quad a.s.. \tag{3.4}$$

Let $A \subset G$ with $\mathbb{P}(R_n = A) > 0$. Then $|A| \le n+1$. In view of Lemma 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned} f(A) &:= \sum_{x\in A} \mathbb{P}(S_n = x|R_n = A) \ln^2 \mathbb{P}(S_n = x|R_n = A) \\ &\le (2 \vee \ln |A|)^2 + 1 \le \ln^2(n+1) + 5. \end{aligned}$$

It follows immediately

$$\mathbb{E}[\ln^2 p_n(S_n|R_n)] = \mathbb{E}[f(R_n)] \le \ln^2(n+1) + 5.$$

Hence for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\sum_n \mathbb{P}\left(\Big| \frac{\ln p_n(S_n|R_n)}{n} \Big| > \varepsilon \right) \le \sum_n \frac{\ln^2(n+1)+5}{n^2\varepsilon^2} < \infty.$$

This proves (3.4) by Borel-Cantelli Lemma. Hence (2.2) and (2.3) hold true for R_n.

The result for Γ_n can be obtained in a similar way and the details are omitted here. □

4 Proof of Theorem 2.2

Proof. By Theorem 2.1, we have $h_R(\mu) = \lim_n \frac{H(R_n,S_n)}{n}$. We also have

$$H(R_n, S_n) - H(R_{n-k}, S_{n-k}) = H(X_1, \cdots, X_k) - H(X_1, \cdots, X_k, R_{n-k} \circ \theta^k \big| R_n, S_n). \quad (4.1)$$

This is because

$$\begin{aligned} & H(R_{n-k} \circ \theta^k, S_{n-k} \circ \theta^k, X_1, \cdots, X_k) \\ =& H(R_n, S_n) + H(R_{n-k} \circ \theta^k, S_{n-k} \circ \theta^k, X_1, \cdots, X_k | R_n, S_n) \\ =& H(R_n, S_n) + H(X_1, \cdots, X_k, R_{n-k} \circ \theta^k \big| R_n, S_n) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H(R_{n-k} \circ \theta^k, S_{n-k} \circ \theta^k, X_1, \cdots, X_k) =& H(R_{n-k} \circ \theta^k, S_{n-k} \circ \theta^k) + H(X_1, \cdots, X_k) \\ =& H(R_{n-k}, S_{n-k}) + H(X_1, \cdots, X_k). \end{aligned}$$

So, if $\lim_n H(X_1,\cdots,X_k,R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k\big|R_n,S_n)$ exists, then

$$kh_R(\mu)=H(X_1,\cdots,X_k)-\lim_n H(X_1,\cdots,X_k,R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k\big|R_n,S_n). \tag{4.2}$$

Since $R_n=R_k\cup S_k(R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k)$, we have

$$R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k=(S_k^{-1}R_n-S_k^{-1}R_k)\cup\big((R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k)\cap(S_k^{-1}R_k)\big).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&H(X_1,\cdots,X_k,R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k\big|R_n,S_n)\\
=&H(X_1,\cdots,X_k,R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k\big|R_n,S_n,X_{n+j},j=1,2,\cdots)\\
=&H(X_1,\cdots,X_k,R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k\big|\mathcal{G}_n)\\
=&H(X_1,\cdots,X_k\big|\mathcal{G}_n)+H(R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k\big|X_1,\cdots,X_k,\mathcal{G}_n)\\
=&H(X_1,\cdots,X_k\big|\mathcal{G}_n)+H((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k\big|X_1,\cdots,X_k,\mathcal{G}_n)\\
=&H(X_1,\cdots,X_k\big|\mathcal{G}_n)+H((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k\big|\mathcal{F}_k\vee\mathcal{G}_n),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_k:=\sigma(X_1,\cdots,X_k)$ stands for the σ-algebra generated by $X_1,\cdots,X_k$. Since $\mathcal{G}_n\downarrow\mathcal{G}_\infty$ we have

$$H(X_1,\cdots,X_k\big|\mathcal{G}_n)\to H(X_1,\cdots,X_k\big|\mathcal{G}_\infty).$$

So, we are left to prove the following limit

$$H((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap(R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k)\big|\mathcal{F}_k\vee\mathcal{G}_n)\to H((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap(R_\infty\circ\theta^k)\big|\mathcal{F}_k\vee\mathcal{G}_\infty). \tag{4.3}$$

Let's write $\phi(t)=-t\ln t,\ t\geq 0$ and put

$$I_n:=\sum_{A:A\subset S_k^{-1}R_k}\phi(\mathbb{P}((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap(R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k)=A\big|\mathcal{F}_k\vee\mathcal{G}_n)).$$

Then $H((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap(R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k)\big|\mathcal{F}_k\vee\mathcal{G}_n)=\mathbb{E}[I_n]$.

Now we estimate each item of I_n. Let $A \subset S_k^{-1}R_k$. Then A is an $\mathcal{F}_k$-measurable random set. Since $R_n \uparrow R_\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\mathbb{P}\Big((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap(R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k)=A\Big|\mathcal{F}_k\vee\mathcal{G}_n\Big)-\mathbb{P}\Big((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap(R_\infty\circ\theta^k)=A\Big|\mathcal{F}_k\vee\mathcal{G}_n\Big)\right|\right)\\
\leq\ &\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{P}\Big((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap(R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k)\neq(S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap(R_\infty\circ\theta^k)\Big|\mathcal{F}_k\vee\mathcal{G}_n\Big)\right]\\
=\ &\mathbb{P}\Big((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap(R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k)\neq(S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap(R_\infty\circ\theta^k)\Big)\to 0
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap(R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k)=A\Big|\mathcal{F}_k\vee\mathcal{G}_n)-\mathbb{P}((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap(R_\infty\circ\theta^k)=A\Big|\mathcal{F}_k\vee\mathcal{G}_n)\xrightarrow{L_1}0.$$

Furthermore, we apply the backward martingale convergence theorem to get

$$\mathbb{P}((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap(R_\infty\circ\theta^k)=A\Big|\mathcal{F}_k\vee\mathcal{G}_n)\to\mathbb{P}((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap(R_\infty\circ\theta^k)=A\Big|\mathcal{F}_k\vee\mathcal{G}_\infty),\ a.s..$$

Hence for each $A\subset S_k^{-1}R_k$,

$$\mathbb{P}((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap(R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k)=A\Big|\mathcal{F}_k\vee\mathcal{G}_n)\to\mathbb{P}((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap(R_\infty\circ\theta^k)=A\Big|\mathcal{F}_k\vee\mathcal{G}_\infty).$$

in probability. On the other hand, since there are at most 2^{k+1} different subsets of $S_k^{-1}R_k$, we have $I_n\leq\ln(2^{k+1})=(k+1)\ln 2$ and

$$I_n\to\sum_{A\subset S_k^{-1}R_k}\phi(\mathbb{P}((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k=A\Big|\mathcal{F}_k\vee\mathcal{G}_\infty))$$

in probability. Then the Dominated Convergence Theorem tells us

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_n\mathbb{E}[I_n]=&\mathbb{E}[\sum_{A\subset S_k^{-1}R_k}\phi(\mathbb{P}((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap R_{n-k}\circ\theta^k=A\Big|\mathcal{F}_k\vee\mathcal{G}_\infty))]\\
=&H((S_k^{-1}R_k)\cap R_\infty\circ\theta^k\Big|\mathcal{F}_k\vee\mathcal{G}_\infty).
\end{aligned}$$

So we have (4.3) and finish the proof of the lemma. □

5 Proof of Theorem 2.3

In order to prove Theorem 2.3 we need the following result.

Lemma 5.1 *Let $\tilde{S}_n = X_1^{-1}X_2^{-1}\cdots X_n^{-1}$ for all n. Let $\tilde{R}_n$ be the range of $\tilde{S}$ until time n. Then (a) $\tilde{S}$ is recurrent if and only if S is recurrent; (b)*$\lim_n \frac{H(\tilde{R}_n)}{n} = \lim_n \frac{H(R_n)}{n}$.

Proof. (a) Suppose that S is recurrent. Then

$$\sum_n \mathbb{P}(S_i \neq e \text{ for any } 1 \leq i < n \text{ and } S_n = e) = 1.$$

Since $(X_1, \cdots, X_n)$ has the same distribution with $(X_n, \cdots, X_1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(S_i \neq e \text{ for any } 1 \leq i < n, \text{ and } S_n = e)\\
=&\mathbb{P}(X_1 \cdots X_i \neq e \text{ for any } 1 \leq i < n, \text{ and } X_1 \cdots X_n = e)\\
=&\mathbb{P}(X_n \cdots X_{n-i+1} \neq e \text{ for any } 1 \leq i < n, \text{ and } X_n \cdots X_1 = e)\\
=&\mathbb{P}(X_{n-i+1}^{-1} \cdots X_n^{-1} \neq e \text{ for any } 1 \leq i < n, \text{ and } X_1^{-1} \cdots X_n^{-1} = e)\\
=&\mathbb{P}(X_1^{-1} \cdots X_{n-i}^{-1} \neq e \text{ for any } 1 \leq i < n, \text{ and } X_1^{-1} \cdots X_n^{-1} = e)\\
=&\mathbb{P}(\tilde{S}_i \neq e \text{ for any } 1 \leq i < n, \text{ and } \tilde{S}_n = e).
\end{aligned}$$

So, we have $\sum_n \mathbb{P}(\tilde{S}_i \neq e \text{ for any } 1 \leq i < n \text{ and } \tilde{S}_n = e) = 1$, which implies $\tilde{S}$ is recurrent.

(b) Since $(X_1, \cdots, X_n)$ has the same distribution with $(X_n, \cdots, X_1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
H(R_n, S_n) \geq& H(S_n^{-1} \cdot R_n)\\
=&H(\{X_n^{-1} \cdots X_i^{-1} : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{e\})\\
=&H(\{X_1^{-1} \cdots X_{n-i+1}^{-1} : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{e\}) = H(\tilde{R}_n).
\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\lim_n \frac{H(R_n)}{n} = \lim_n \frac{H(R_n, S_n)}{n} \geq \lim_n \frac{H(\tilde{R}_n)}{n}.$$

Similarly, we have $\lim_n \frac{H(\tilde{R}_n)}{n} \geq \lim_n \frac{H(R_n)}{n}$, and so we have (b). □

Proof of Theorem 2.3. We shall prove (1) ⇒ (2) ⇒ (3) ⇒ (4) ⇒ (1).

Part Proof: (1)⇒(2). Let $\tilde{\mu}$ be the probability measure on G such that $\tilde{\mu}(x) = \mu(x^{-1})$

for all $x \in G$. Define $\tilde{S}$ and $\tilde{R}_n$ as in Lemma 5.1. Then $\tilde{S}$ is a $(G, \tilde{\mu})-$random walk. For each $x \in G$, set

$$\tau_x = \inf\{n \geq 1 : S_n = x\} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\tau}_x := \inf\{n \geq 1 : \tilde{S}_n = x\}.$$

Write $G_\mu = \{x : \mathbb{P}(\tau_x < \infty) = 1\}$ and $G_{\tilde{\mu}} = \{x : \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_x < \infty) = 1\}$. By Lemma 5.1(b), to prove (1) implies (2), it suffices to show that (1) implies $G_{\tilde{\mu}} \neq \emptyset$. Since $H(X_1) > 0$, we have $|\text{supp}(\mu)| \geq 2$. The rest proof of (1)$\Rightarrow$(2) is divided into three cases.

Case I: there is an element $a \in G\backslash\{e\}$ such that $\text{supp}(\mu) = \{a, e\}$. Then $\text{supp}(\tilde{\mu}) = \{a^{-1}, e\}$. It implies that $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_{a^{-1}} < \infty) = 1$ and $G_{\tilde{\mu}} \neq \emptyset$ as desired.

Case II: there are two different elements $a, b \in \text{supp}(\mu) \cap G_\mu$. Then

$$0 = \mathbb{P}(\tau_a = \infty) \geq \mathbb{P}(S_1 = b)\mathbb{P}(\tau_a = \infty | S_1 = b) = \mu(b)\mathbb{P}(\tau_{b^{-1}a} = \infty), \tag{5.1}$$

which implies $b^{-1}a \in G_\mu$. Similarly, $a^{-1}b \in G_\mu$. Hence $e = (b^{-1}a)(a^{-1}b) \in G_\mu$, which implies S is recurrent. By Lemma 5.1, process $\tilde{S}$ is recurrent and so $G_{\tilde{\mu}} \neq \emptyset$.

Case III: there is an element $g \in G\backslash\{e\}$ such that $0 < \mu(g) < 1$ and $P(\tau_g = \infty) > 0$. Let us show the following inequality first

$$h_R(\mu) \geq -\mathbb{P}(\tau_g = \infty)\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_e = \tilde{\tau}_g = \infty) \ln[1 - \mu(g)]. \tag{5.2}$$

To prove the statement above, for $A \subset G$ we set

$$\partial A := \partial_g A = \{x \in A : xg \notin A\}.$$

Similarly as [3, Lemma 3 and Corollary 4], one can get $\mathbb{P}(R_n = A) \leq [1 - \mu(g)]^{|\partial A|-1}$ and

$$H(R_n) \geq -(\mathbb{E}|\partial R_n| - 1) \ln[1 - \mu(g)]. \tag{5.3}$$

So we need estimate $|\partial R_n|$ further. For $x \in G\backslash\{e, g^{-1}\}$ and $1 \leq m \leq n$, set

$$F_{x,m} := \{S_i \notin \{x, xg\} \text{ for all } 1 \leq i < m\} \cap \{S_m = x\} \cap \{S_j \neq xg \text{ for all } m < j \leq n\}.$$

Then $\{x \in \partial R_n\} = F_{x,1} \cup \cdots \cup F_{x,n}$. Hence

$$\mathbb{E}(|\partial R_n|) \geq \sum_{1 \leq m \leq n} \sum_{x \neq e, g^{-1}} \mathbb{P}(F_{x,m}).$$

Furthermore, by the Markov property

$$\mathbb{P}(F_{x,m}) = \mathbb{P}(S_i \notin \{x, xg\}, \forall 1 \leq i < m, S_m = x)\mathbb{P}(\tau_g > n - m).$$

Since $(X_1, \cdots, X_m)$ has the same law with $(X_m, \cdots, X_1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{x \neq e, g^{-1}} \mathbb{P}(S_i \notin \{x, xg\}, \forall 1 \leq i < m, S_m = x) \\
= & \sum_{x \neq e, g^{-1}} \mathbb{P}(X_1 X_2 \cdots X_i \notin \{x, xg\}, \forall 1 \leq i < m, X_1 X_2 \cdots X_m = x) \\
= & \sum_{x \neq e, g^{-1}} \mathbb{P}(X_m X_{m-1} \cdots X_{m-i+1} \notin \{x, xg\}, \forall 1 \leq i < m, X_m X_{m-1} \cdots X_1 = x) \\
= & \sum_{x \neq e, g^{-1}} \mathbb{P}(X_1^{-1} X_2^{-1} \cdots X_{m-i}^{-1} \notin \{e, g\}, \forall 1 \leq i < m, X_1^{-1} X_2^{-1} \cdots X_m^{-1} = x^{-1}) \\
= & \mathbb{P}(X_1^{-1} X_2^{-1} \cdots X_i^{-1} \notin \{e, g\}, \forall 1 \leq i \leq m) = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{S}_i \notin \{e, g\}, \forall 1 \leq i \leq m).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(|\partial R_n|) & \geq \sum_{1 \leq m \leq n} \mathbb{P}(\tau_g > n - m) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\tilde{S}_i \notin \{e, g\}, \forall 1 \leq i \leq m) \\
& \geq n\mathbb{P}(\tau_g = \infty) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_e = \tilde{\tau}_g = \infty).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (5.2) holds.

Now assume condition (1). Applying (5.2), we then get $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_e = \tilde{\tau}_g = \infty) = 0$, which implies $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_e < \tilde{\tau}_g) + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_g < \tilde{\tau}_e) = 1$. By the strong Markov property,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_g < \infty) & = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_g < \tilde{\tau}_e) + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_e < \tilde{\tau}_g, \tilde{\tau}_g < \infty) \\
& = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_g < \tilde{\tau}_e) + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_e < \tilde{\tau}_g) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_g < \infty).
\end{aligned}$$

So either $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_e < \tilde{\tau}_g) = 1$ or $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_g < \infty) = 1$ holds, which proves **(1)** $\Rightarrow$ **(2)**. □

Part Proof: (2)⇒(3). Write $G_\mu = \{x : \mathbb{P}(\tau_x < \infty) = 1\}$, and set

$$\tau_x := \inf\{n \geq 1 : S_n = x\} \text{ and } T_x := \inf\{n \geq 0 : S_n = x\} \text{ for } x \in G.$$

By the condition (2), we have $G_\mu \neq \emptyset$. If $|G_\mu \cap \mathrm{supp}(\mu)| \geq 2$, then as Case II in $(\mathbf{1}) \Rightarrow (\mathbf{2})$, we can prove S is recurrent. If $e \in G_\mu$ then S is recurrent, too. So, we may assume that S is transient, $|G_\mu \cap \mathrm{supp}(\mu)| \leq 1$ and there exists $x_0 \in G_\mu$ such that $x_0 \neq e$ in the following.

If $y \in G$ with $\mathbb{P}(T_y < \tau_{x_0}) > 0$, then $y^{-1}x_0 \in G_\mu$. This is because

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_{x_0} = \infty) \geq \mathbb{P}(T_y < \tau_{x_0}) \cdot \mathbb{P}^y(\tau_{x_0} = \infty) = \mathbb{P}(T_y < \tau_{x_0}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\tau_{y^{-1}x_0} = \infty).$$

For any $a \in G$ with $\mathbb{P}(S_{\tau_{x_0}-1} = x_0 a) > 0$, we know

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{x_0 a} < \tau_{x_0}) > 0 \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(X_1 = a^{-1}) > 0,$$

which implies $a^{-1} \in G_\mu \cap \mathrm{supp}(\mu)$. This argument means that for any $x \in G_\mu \backslash \{e\}$ and $b \in G$ with $\mathbb{P}(S_{\tau_x - 1} = xb) > 0$, we have $b^{-1} \in G_\mu \cap \mathrm{supp}(\mu)$. By the assumption $|G_\mu \cap \mathrm{supp}(\mu)| \leq 1$, we have $a = b$ and so,

$$\mathbb{P}(S_{\tau_x - 1} = xa) = 1 \quad \text{for all } x \in G_\mu.$$

Further, if $x \in G_\mu \setminus \{e, a^{-1}, a^{-2}, \cdots\}$ then $\{S_{\tau_x - 1} = xa\} \subseteq \{\tau_{xa} + 1 \leq \tau_x < \infty\}$ and so, $\tau_{xa} + 1 \leq \tau_x < \infty \quad a.s.$. Iterating the inequality, we get $\tau_x \geq n + \tau_{xa^n} \quad a.s.$ for any $n \geq 1$, which contradict to $\mathbb{P}(\tau_x < \infty) = 1$. Hence

$$G_\mu \subset \{e, a^{-1}, a^{-2}, \cdots\}.$$

Since $\mathbb{P}(T_x < \tau_{a^{-1}}) \geq \mu(x) > 0$ for $x \in \mathrm{supp}(\mu) \setminus \{a^{-1}\}$, as before we have

$$x^{-1}a^{-1} \in G_\mu \quad \text{for } x \in \mathrm{supp}(\mu) \setminus \{a^{-1}\}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathrm{supp}(\mu) \subset \{a^{-1}b^{-1} : b \in G_\mu\} \cup \{a^{-1}\} \subset \{a^{-1}, e, a, a^2, \cdots\}.$$

So, we can view S as a simple random walk on $\mathbb{Z}$ without left jump. Since S is transient and $G_\mu \subset \{e, a^{-1}, a^{-2}, \cdots\}$, process S must be a random walk escaping to $-\infty$ without left jump. Anyway, (3) is true. $\square$

Part Proof: (3)⇒(4). If S is recurrent, then $R_\infty = R_\infty \circ \theta = G$ almost surely. Similar as the proof of case 1 of Theorem 6.7.3 in [7], one can show that $\mathcal{G}_\infty$ is trivial and hence (4) holds for this case.

Now we assume that S is a random walk escaping to $-\infty$ without left jump. Then G is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$. As we are just concerning the entropies and the tail $\sigma-$algebra, we may assume further that μ is supported on $\{k \in \mathbb{Z} : k \geq -1\}$ with $\mathbb{E}X_1 \in (-1, 0)$ (and hence $\lim_n S_n = -\infty$ a.s.).

Let $\eta := \sup\{S_n : n \geq 0\}$ and $\xi := \eta \circ \theta$. Then $\eta, \xi < \infty$ a.s.. Note that

$$R_\infty = (-\infty, \eta] \cap \mathbb{Z}.$$

So in order to prove the first equality of (4), it suffices to show $H(\xi|\eta) = H(\eta|\xi)$. Write $\eta_n = \eta \wedge n, \xi_n = \xi \wedge n$. Since η and ξ have the same distribution,

$$H(\eta_n|\xi_n) = H(\xi_n, \eta_n) - H(\xi_n) = H(\xi_n, \eta_n) - H(\eta_n) = H(\xi_n|\eta_n).$$

So, it also suffices to show that $H(\eta_n|\xi_n) \to H(\eta|\xi)$ and $H(\xi_n|\eta_n) \to H(\xi|\eta)$ as $n \to \infty$.

Put $\phi(t) := -t \ln, \forall t \geq 0$. A direct calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} H(\eta_n|\xi_n) &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{P}(\xi = i) \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \cdot \phi(\mathbb{P}(\eta = j|\xi = i)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{P}(\xi = i) \cdot \phi(\mathbb{P}(\eta \geq n|\xi = i)) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(\xi \geq n) \cdot H(\eta_n|\xi \geq n) \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

By the Monotone Convergence Theorem, we have $\lim_n I_1 = H(\eta|\xi)$. By the Dominated Convergence Theorem, $\lim_n I_2 = 0$. Note that $\eta = \max\{0, X_1, X_1 + \xi\}$. We have $\eta \geq \xi - 1$ and hence $\eta_n \in \{n-1, n\}$ if $\xi \geq n$. So,

$$H(\eta_n|\xi \geq n) \leq \ln 2.$$

It follows $\lim_n I_3 = 0$ immediately. Therefore $\lim_{n\to\infty} H(\eta_n|\xi_n) = H(\eta|\xi)$.

Similarly, in order to prove $\lim_{n\to\infty} H(\xi_n|\eta_n) = H(\xi|\eta)$, we need only to show that

$$I_3' := \mathbb{P}(\eta \geq n) H(\xi_n|\eta \geq n) \to 0. \tag{5.4}$$

Since ξ and X_1 are independent, and $\eta = \max\{0, X_1, X_1 + \xi\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi(\mathbb{P}(\xi = j, \eta \geq n)) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi(\mathbb{P}(\xi = j, X_1 \geq n - j)) \\
=&\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi(\mathbb{P}(\xi = j)) \cdot \mathbb{P}(X_1 \geq n - j) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(X_1 \geq k) \cdot \phi(\mathbb{P}(\xi = n - k)).
\end{aligned}$$

By the Dominated Convergence Theorem and the L^1-integrability of X_1, we get that both the two summations above tend to zero as $n \to \infty$. Hence

$$I_3' \leq \phi(\mathbb{P}(\xi \geq n, \eta \geq n)) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi(\mathbb{P}(\xi = j, \eta \geq n)) \to 0.$$

As $I_3' \geq 0$ for all n, we then have (5.4). This proves the first equality of (4).

We proceed to prove $\mathcal{G}_\infty \equiv \sigma(R_\infty) \mod \mathbb{P}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{G}_\infty \supseteq \sigma(R_\infty)$. Since $R_\infty = (-\infty, \eta] \cap \mathbb{Z}$, we need only to show $\mathcal{G}_\infty \subseteq \sigma(\eta) \mod \mathbb{P}$. Write

$$\rho = \inf\big\{n \geq 0 : S_n = 0,\ \sup\{S_k : k \geq n\} \leq \max\{S_k : k \leq n\}\ \big\}.$$

As $\lim_n S_n = -\infty$ a.s., we have $\rho < \infty$ a.s.. For $n \geq 0$, set $M_n = \inf\{S_k : k \leq n\}$. Then $R_n = [M_n, \eta] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ conditioned on $\rho \leq n$. For $E \in \mathcal{G}_\infty$ and $n \geq 1$, there exists non-random set A_n such that

$$E = \big\{\{(R_k, S_k) : k \geq n\} \in A_n\big\}.$$

Let $E_n = \big\{\{([M_k, \eta], S_k) : k \geq n\} \in A_n\big\}$. Then conditioned on $\{\rho < \infty\}$, there has

$$E = \bigcup_{n\geq 1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{k=n}^{\infty} E_n \in \mathcal{H},$$

where $\mathcal{H} := \bigcap_n \sigma(\eta, M_k, S_k : k \geq n)$. So, from $\rho < \infty$ a.s. we get

$$\mathcal{G}_\infty \subseteq \mathcal{H} \mod \mathbb{P}.$$

As the possible values of η are countable,

$$\mathcal{H} = \sigma(\eta) \vee \bigcap_n \sigma(M_k, S_k : k \geq n).$$

Let $T_0 = 0$. Set $T_k = \inf\{n > T_{k-1} : X_n = -k\}$ and $U_k = (S_{T_{k-1}}, \cdots, S_{T_k}) + k$ for $k \geq 1$. Then $U_1, U_2, \cdots$ are i.i.d., and $\bigcap_n \sigma(M_k, S_k : k \geq n)$ is contained in the exchangeable field of $U_1, U_2, \cdots$. By Hewitt Savage 0-1 law, $\bigcap_n \sigma(M_k, S_k : k \geq n)$ is trivial. Therefore we have $\mathcal{G}_\infty \subseteq \mathcal{H} \equiv \sigma(\eta) \mod \mathbb{P}$ as desired. □

Part Proof: (4)⇒(1). By (4), we get

$$\begin{aligned} H(X_1, R_\infty \circ \theta | \mathcal{G}_\infty) &= H(X_1, R_\infty \circ \theta | R_\infty) = H(R_\infty \circ \theta | R_\infty) + H(X_1 | R_\infty \circ \theta, R_\infty) \\ &= H(R_\infty | R_\infty \circ \theta) + H(X_1 | R_\infty \circ \theta, R_\infty) \\ &= H(X_1, R_\infty | R_\infty \circ \theta) = H(X_1 | R_\infty \circ \theta) = H(X_1). \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 2.2, it follows immediately

$$h_R(\mu) = H(X_1) - H(X_1, R_\infty \circ \theta \big| \mathcal{G}_\infty) = 0.$$

We have completed the proof of Theorem 2.3. □

6 Proof of Theorem 2.4

In order to prove this theorem, we need more notations. We encode each realization of the random weighted graph Γ_n as the following. Set $G = \{g_i : i \geq 0\}$ with $g_0 = e$ and write $\mathbb{V} = \cup_{l=1}^\infty \mathbb{N}^l$. We give a dictionary order of $\mathbb{V}$. That is, for any two vector $x \in \mathbb{N}^i$ and $y = \mathbb{N}^j$, we say that x prior to y if either $i < j$ or $i = j$ with $x^{(1)} = y^{(1)}, \cdots, x^{(l-1)} = y^{(l-1)}, x^{(l)} < y^{(l)}$ for some $l \leq i$. Define $\zeta : \mathbb{V} \to G$ as follows:

$$\zeta(v) = g_{v^{(1)}} \cdots g_{v^{(l)}} \quad \text{for } v = (v^{(1)}, \cdots, v^{(l)}) \in \mathbb{N}^l \text{ and } l \geq 1.$$

Now fix (A, B, C) an arbitrary realization of Γ_n. We use the width first research algorithm to visit every vertex of the digraph (A, B).

Step 0: visit $v_0 = e$. Set $N_0 = \{i \geq 0 : (e, g_i) \in B\}$ and $V_0 = N_0 \setminus \{0\}$.

$\cdots$

Step $h < |A|$: choose $x \in V_{h-1}$, so that x prior to all other elements of V_{h-1}; visit $v_h = \zeta(x)$; and set $N_h = \{i \geq 0 : (v_h, v_h g_i) \in B\}$ and

$$V_h = (V_{h-1} \cup \{(x, i) : i \in N_h\}) \setminus \{v \in \mathbb{V} : \zeta(v) \in \{v_0, \cdots, v_h\}\}.$$

$\cdots$

Since Γ_n is generated by the first n steps of random walk S and $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_n = (A, B, C)) > 0$, for each $v \in A \setminus \{e\}$ there exists at least one oriented path from e to v. This ensures that at each step of the algorithm above, we always have $V_{h-1} \neq \emptyset$. Furthermore,

$$\{v_h : 0 \leq h < |A|\} = A \text{ and } \ V_{|A|-1} = \emptyset.$$

Note that v_0 and V_0 are determined by N_0. So, v_h and V_h are determined by $N_0, \cdots, N_h$ for every $h < |A|$. Especially, $v_0, \cdots, v_{|A|-1}$ are determined by $N_0, \cdots, N_{|A|-1}$. Therefore, $\{N_h : h < |A|\}$ are one-to-one corresponding to (A, B).

Next, for each $i, h \geq 0$, set

$$O^{i,h} = \begin{cases} C((v_h, v_h g_i)), & if\ h < |A| \text{ and } (v_h, v_h g_i) \in B; \\ 0, & otherwise. \end{cases}$$

Then for $h < |A|$ we have $N_h = \{i \geq 0 : O^{i,h} > 0\}$, which implies $(A, B, C) \mapsto \{O^{i,h} : i, h \geq 0\}$ is also one to one.

Now we define a sequence of random variables. For $i, h \geq 0$ and $n \geq 1$, set

$$O_n^{i,h} = O^{i,h}(\Gamma_n).$$

Write $O_n = \{O_n^{i,h} : i, h \geq 0\}$. As the statement above, $\Gamma_n \mapsto O_n$ is one to one, and so

$$H(\Gamma_n) = H(O_n). \tag{6.1}$$

Set $O_n^i = \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} O_n^{i,h}$. Then $O_n^i = \sum_{k=1}^{n} 1_{\{X_k=g_i\}}$, which implies $O_n^i \sim B(n, \mu(g_i))$ and

$$\lim_n \frac{O_n^i}{n} = \mu(g_i) \quad \text{a.s..} \tag{6.2}$$

The following result plays a key role in the upper bound of $H(\Gamma_n)$.

Lemma 6.1 *Let* $Y_n^i = O_n^i \ln(1 + \frac{|R_n|-1}{O_n^i}) + (|R_n| - 1)\ln(1 + \frac{O_n^i}{|R_n|-1})$. *Then*

$$\overline{\lim_n} \frac{H(\Gamma_n)}{n} \le \overline{\lim_n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\left(Y_n^i\right).$$

Proof. By (6.1),

$$H(\Gamma_n) = H(O_n) \le H(|R_n|) + H(O_n^i, i \ge 0) + H(O_n \big|\ |R_n|, O_n^i, i \ge 0).$$

We estimate the three terms separately. First, $\lim_n n^{-1} H(|R_n|) = 0$ since $|R_n| \le n + 1$. Next, fix $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and calculate

$$\begin{aligned} H(O_n^i, i \ge 0) \le & \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} H(O_n^i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} H(X_i 1_{\{X_i \notin \{g_j : j<M\}\}}) \\ \le & M \ln(n+1) + nH(X_1 1_{\{X_1 \notin \{g_j : j<M\}\}}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\lim_n n^{-1} H(O_n^i, i \ge 0) \le H(X_1 1_{\{X_1 \in \{g_j : j \ge M\}\}}).$$

By the arbitrariness of M and noting $H(X_1) < \infty$, we get that the right side of the above inequality vanishes as n goes to infinity.

We shall estimate the third term. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+, i \ge 0$ be constants. If $|R_n| = k$ and $O_n^i = a_i$ for $i \ge 0$, then for each $i \ge 0$, there are $\binom{a_i+k-1}{k-1}$ possibilities at most for the choices of $(O_n^{i,h}, h \ge 0)$ since $\sum_{h=0}^{k-1} O_n^{i,h} = a_i$. Hence the number of different choices of O_n is $\prod_{i\ge 0} \binom{a_i+k-1}{k-1}$ at most. Therefore,

$$H(O_n \big| |R_n| = k, O_n^i = a_i, i \ge 0) \le \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \ln \binom{a_i + k - 1}{k-1}.$$

From the Stirling formula, one knows

$$\binom{m}{l} \le \left(\frac{m}{l}\right)^l \left(\frac{m}{m-l}\right)^{m-l} \quad \text{for all } m > l \ge 1.$$

Therefore, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{a_i : i \ge 0\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$ we have

$$H(O_n \big| |R_n| = k, O_n^i = a_i, i \ge 0) \le \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(a_i \ln(1 + \frac{k-1}{a_i}) + (k-1)\ln(1 + \frac{a_i}{k-1}) \right),$$

which implies

$$H(O_n \big| \ |R_n|, O_n^i, i \ge 0) \le \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}(Y_n^i).$$

Combining the estimates of the three terms, we get the desired result. □

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Suppose that S is transient. Let $\tau_x = \inf\{n \ge 1 : S_n = x\}$ and $T_x = \inf\{n \ge 0 : S_n = x\}$ for all $x \in G$, where $\inf \emptyset = \infty$. Then $\mathbb{P}(\tau_e < \infty) < 1$. Since $\mathbb{P}(\tau_e = \infty) = \sum_{a \ne e} \mu(a)\mathbb{P}(\tau_{a^{-1}} = \infty)$, there exists some $a \in G \backslash \{e\}$ such that $\mu(a) \in (0,1)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\tau_{a^{-1}} = \infty) > 0$. For each realization (A, B, C) of Γ_n, set

$$\diamondsuit_a(A, B, C) = \big\{ x \in A : \{g \in G : (x, xg) \in B\} = \{a\} \big\}.$$

By the strong Markov property

$$\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_n = (A, B, C)) \le \mathbb{P}(X_{T_x+1} = a \text{ for all } x \in \diamondsuit_a(A, B, C)) \le \mu(a)^{|\diamondsuit_a(A,B,C)|},$$

So,

$$H(\Gamma_n) \ge -\mathbb{E}|\diamondsuit_a \Gamma_n| \ \ln[\mu(a)].$$

Note that if $T_x < n$, $X_{T_x+1} = a$ and $S_k \ne x$ for all $k > T_x + 1$, then $x \in \diamondsuit_a \Gamma_n$. Hence

$$\mathbb{E}|\diamondsuit_a \Gamma_n| \ge \sum_x \mathbb{P}(T_x < n)\mu(a)\mathbb{P}(\tau_{a^{-1}} = \infty) = \mu(a)\mathbb{P}(\tau_{a^{-1}} = \infty)\mathbb{E}|R_{n-1}|.$$

Since S_n is transient, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}|R_n|/n = \gamma_{\text{escape}} := \mathbb{P}(S_n \ne e, \forall n \ge 1)$ by [6]. Therefore

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{H(\Gamma_n)}{n} \ge [-\mu(a) \cdot \ln \mu(a)] \cdot \mathbb{P}(\tau_{a^{-1}} = \infty) \cdot \gamma_{\text{escape}} > 0.$$

On the other hand, suppose S is recurrent. Then by [6] we have $|R_n|/n \to 0$ $a.s.$. Recall the definition of Y_n^i in Lemma 6.1. Using (6.2), we conclude that with probability one

$$\lim_n \frac{Y_n^i}{n} \leq \lim_n \frac{|R_n|-1}{n} \ln(1+\frac{n}{|R_n|-1}) + \frac{O_n^i}{n} \ln(1+\frac{|R_n|-1}{O_n^i}) = 0.$$

Note that $Y_n^i \leq (|R_n|-1) + O_n^i \leq 2n$ since $\ln(1+x) \leq x$ for all $x \geq 0$. Then by the Dominated Convergence Theorem,

$$\lim_n \frac{\mathbb{E}(Y_n^i)}{n} = 0. \tag{6.3}$$

On the other hand, using $\ln(1+x) \leq x$ again we have

$$Y_n^i \leq O_n^i \ln\left(\frac{2n}{O_n^i}\right) + O_n^i \leq O_n^i(2+\ln n) - O_n^i \ln O_n^i.$$

Since $f(x) = -x\ln x$ is concave on $(0,\infty)$ and $O_n^i \sim B(n,\mu(g_i))$,

$$\mathbb{E}(-O_n^i \ln O_n^i) \leq -\mathbb{E}(O_n^i)\ln(\mathbb{E}(O_n^i)) = -n\mu(g_i)\ln(n\mu(g_i)).$$

So,

$$n^{-1}\mathbb{E}(Y_n^i) \leq \mu(g_i)(2+\ln n) - \mu(g_i)\ln(n\mu(g_i)) = 2\mu(g_i) - \mu(g_i)\ln(\mu(g_i)). \tag{6.4}$$

Note that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left[2\mu(g_i) - \mu(g_i)\ln(\mu(g_i))\right] = 2 + H(X_1) < \infty.$$

By (6.3) and the Dominated Convergence Theorem, we obtain

$$\lim_n \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}(Y_n^i)}{n} = 0.$$

Applying Lemma 6.1, we get $\lim_n \frac{H(\Gamma_n)}{n} = 0$ and complete the proof of the theorem. □

7 Some Related Results

7.1 Extreme Case $h_R(\mu) = H(X_1)$

As is known, $0 \leq h_R(\mu) \leq H(X_1)$. In this subsection, we would consider the extreme case $h_R(\mu) = H(X_1)$.

Theorem 7.1 *$h_R(\mu) = H(X_1)$ if and only if the escape rate of process S satisfies*

$$\gamma_{\text{escape}} := \mathbb{P}(S_n \neq e, \forall n \geq 1) = 1.$$

In addition, if $h_R(\mu) = H(X_1)$ then $\sigma(R_n) = \sigma(X_k : 1 \leq k \leq n)$ and $H(R_n) = H(R_n, S_n) = nH(\mu)$ for all $n \geq 1$.

Proof. Let $\gamma_{\text{escape}} < 1$. Then there exists $n \geq 1$ and elements $a_1, \cdots, a_n \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ such that $a_1 a_2 \cdots a_n = e$. Since $H(X_1) > 0$, we can find some $b \in \text{supp}(\mu) \backslash \{a_1\}$. Let

$$\mathbf{x} = (a_1, \cdots, a_n, a_1, \cdots, a_n, b, a_1, \cdots, a_n) \text{ and } \mathbf{y} = (a_1, \cdots, a_n, b, a_1, \cdots, a_n, a_1, \cdots, a_n).$$

Then both $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ are possible realizations of $(X_1, \cdots, X_{3n+1})$. Moreover, if $(X_1, \cdots, X_{3n+1}) \in \{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\}$ then $S_{3n+1} = b$ and $R_{3n+1} = \{e, a_1, a_1a_2, \cdots, a_1a_2 \cdots a_{n-1}, b, ba_1, ba_1a_2, \cdots, ba_1 \cdots a_{n-1}\}$. Hence $H(X_1, \cdots, X_{3n+1} \big| R_{3n+1}, S_{3n+1}) > 0$, which implies

$$H(R_{3n+1}, S_{3n+1}) < H(X_1, \cdots, X_{3n+1}) = (3n+1)H(X_1).$$

Using (3.2), we then have

$$h_R(\mu) \leq \tfrac{H(R_{3n+1}, S_{3n+1})}{3n+1} < H(X_1).$$

Next, suppose that $\gamma_{\text{escape}} = 1$, this means $\mathbb{P}(\tau_e < \infty) = 0$. For any two $x, y \in G$, we call $x \prec y$ if and only if $\mathbb{P}(\tau_{x^{-1}y} < \infty) > 0$. Then the binary relation '$\prec$' is a strict partial order (i.e., $x \prec y$ implies $x \neq y$ and not $y \prec x$). By definition, with probability one

$$e = S_0 \prec S_1 \prec S_2 \prec \cdots.$$

Therefore, for each $n + 1 \geq k \geq 1$, element S_{k-1} is almost surely the k-th least element among R_n. It follows that $\sigma(R_n) = \sigma(S_k : 0 \leq k \leq n) = \sigma(X_1, \cdots, X_n)$ and hence $h_R(\mu) = H(\mu)$. □

Remark 1 *When $\gamma_{\text{escape}} = 1$, it is possible that $h_S(\mu) = 0 < h_R(\mu)$, e.g., S is the $(\mathbb{Z}^2, \mu)$-random walk with $\mu(\{(1,0)\}) = \mu(\{(0,1)\}) = \frac{1}{2}$.*

Remark 2 *If* $\gamma_{\text{escape}} = 1$*, then by Theorem 7.1, we have* $H(R_\infty \circ \theta | R_\infty) = 0$ *and* $H(R_\infty | R_\infty \circ \theta) = H(X_1)$*. This gives an example that* $H(R_\infty \circ \theta | R_\infty) \neq H(R_\infty | R_\infty \circ \theta)$*;so the first condition in* (4) *of Theorem 2.3 is nontrivial. It is easy to see that if* $H(R_\infty) < \infty$ *the condition* $H(R_\infty \circ \theta | R_\infty) = H(R_\infty | R_\infty \circ \theta)$ *holds automatically.*

7.2 Extreme Case $h_R(\mu) = 0$ for Transient SRW

Let us fix S as a $(\mathbb{Z}, \mu)-$random walk escaping to $-\infty$ without left jump. Recall $\eta = \sup\{S_n : n \geq 0\}$ and $R_\infty = (-\infty, \eta] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ a.s. (see the Part Proof: (3)⇒(4) in Section 5). We will discuss whether $H(R_\infty)$ is finite or not.

First, we show a relation between the finiteness of the entropy of an $\mathbb{N}$-valued random variable Y and the integrability of $\ln Y$.

Lemma 7.2 *Let* Y *be an* $\mathbb{N}$*-valued random variable. If* $\mathbb{E}(\ln Y) < \infty$*, then* $H(Y) < \infty$*. Conversely, if the probability sequence* $\{p_n := \mathbb{P}(Y = n) : n \geq 1\}$ *is eventually decreasing in* n*, then* $H(Y) < \infty$ *also implies* $\mathbb{E}(\ln Y) < \infty$*.*

Proof. Since $-x \ln x$ is increasing on $(0, 1/4]$,

$$\begin{aligned} H(Y) &= \sum_{n\geq 1} -p_n \ln p_n \\ &\leq -p_1 \ln p_1 - \sum_{n\geq 2: p_n < n^{-2}} p_n \ln p_n + \sum_{n\geq 2: p_n \geq n^{-2}} p_n \ln \tfrac{1}{p_n} \\ &\leq e^{-1} - \sum_{n\geq 2: p_n < n^{-2}} n^{-2} \ln(n^{-2}) + \sum_{n\geq 2: p_n \geq n^{-2}} p_n \ln n^2 \\ &\leq C + 2\mathbb{E}(\ln Y), \end{aligned}$$

where $C = e^{-1} + 2 \sum_{n\geq 2} \frac{\ln n}{n^2} < \infty$. This proves the first part of the lemma.

Conversely, assume for simplicity that p_n is decreasing in n. Then we must have $p_n \leq 1/n$, and so

$$H(Y) = \sum_n -p_n \ln p_n \geq \sum_n p_n \ln n = \mathbb{E}(\ln Y).$$

This proves the second part of the lemma. □

Theorem 7.3 *Let S be a $(\mathbb{Z},\mu)-$random walk escaping to $-\infty$ without left jump. Then, $H(R_\infty)<\infty$ if and only if $\mathbb{E}[|X_1|\ln|X_1|]<\infty$.*

Proof. For each $k\geq -1$, set

$$p_k:=\mathbb{P}(X_1=k),\quad p_{k+}:=\sum_{\ell=k}^{\infty}p_l,\quad p_{k++}:=\sum_{\ell=k}^{\infty}p_{l+}.$$

Write $f_k:=\mathbb{P}(\eta=k)$ for $k\geq 0$, and define f_{k+} in a similar way. Put

$$F(t):=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}f_n\cdot t^n,\quad P(t):=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}p_n\cdot t^n,\quad t\in[0,1].$$

Since $\eta=\max\{0,X_1,X_1+\eta\circ\theta\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
F(t) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(t^{\eta}\big|X_1)]\\
&= \mathbb{P}(X_1=-1)\cdot\mathbb{E}[t^{\max\{0,\eta-1\}}]+\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\mathbb{P}(X_1=n)\cdot\mathbb{E}[t^{\eta+n}]\\
&= q[\mathbb{P}(\eta=0)+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathbb{P}(\eta=n)\cdot t^{n-1}]+P(t)\cdot F(t)\\
&= q[f_0+\frac{F(t)-f_0}{t}]+P(t)\cdot F(t),
\end{aligned}$$

where we write $q=p_{-1}$ for convenience. Hence

$$F(t)=\frac{q\cdot f_0(1-t)}{q+t\cdot P(t)-t},\quad t\in(0,1). \tag{7.1}$$

Put

$$\bar{P}(t):=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}p_{n+}\cdot t^n.$$

Then for $t\in(0,1)$,

$$\bar{P}(t)=\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}p_l\frac{t-t^{l+1}}{1-t}=\tfrac{t}{1-t}\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}p_l-\tfrac{t}{1-t}\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}p_lt^l=\frac{t(1-q)}{1-t}-\frac{tP(t)}{1-t}.$$

So, (7.1) can be rewritten as

$$F(t)=\frac{q\cdot f_0}{q-\bar{P}(t)},\quad t\in(0,1), \tag{7.2}$$

which implies

$$F(t)-f_0=F(t)\bar{P}(t)/q.$$

Comparing the coefficients of t^n in the series expansions of both sides, we obtain

$$f_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} p_{k+} \cdot f_{n-k}/q \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

Therefore, for each $n \geq 1$,

$$f_n \geq p_{n+} f_0/q. \tag{7.3}$$

Now, assume $H(R_\infty) < \infty$. Then $H(\eta) < \infty$ and so $\sum_n -f_n \ln f_n < \infty$. Since S is a random walk escaping to $-\infty$, we have $f_0 = \mathbb{P}(\eta = 0) = \mathbb{P}(S_n \leq 0 \text{ for all } n) > 0$. Applying (7.3) gives

$$\sum_n -p_{n+} \cdot \ln p_{n+} < \infty.$$

Since p_{n+} is decreasing in n, we apply Lemma 7.2 to get

$$\sum_{n}^{\infty} p_{n+} \cdot \ln n < \infty.$$

It follows $\mathbb{E}[|X_1| \ln |X_1|] < \infty$ immediately.

Conversely, suppose $\mathbb{E}[|X_1| \ln |X_1|] < \infty$. Then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{p_{k++}}{k} < \infty.$$

By (7.2), we have $q - \bar{P}(1) = \frac{qf_0}{F(1)} = qf_0$. So for $t \in [0, 1)$,

$$F(1) - F(t) = 1 - \frac{qf_0}{q - \bar{P}(t)} = \frac{\bar{P}(1) - \bar{P}(t)}{q - \bar{P}(t)} \leq \frac{\bar{P}(1) - \bar{P}(t)}{q - \bar{P}(1)} = \frac{1}{qf_0}[\bar{P}(1) - \bar{P}(t)].$$

Dividing by $1 - t$ into both sides, we get

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n \sum_{k=1}^{n} t^{k-1} = \frac{1}{qf_0} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} p_{n+1} \sum_{k=1}^{n} t^{k-1}.$$

Hence

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_{k+} \cdot t^{k-1} \leq \frac{1}{qf_0} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p_{k++} \cdot t^{k-1}.$$

Integrating of the both sides with respect to t on $[0,1]$, we get

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{f_{k+}}{k}\leq\frac{1}{qf_0}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{p_{k++}}{k}<\infty,$$

which implies $\mathbb{E}\ln(\eta+1)<\infty$. By Lemma 7.2, $H(R_\infty)=H(\eta+1)<\infty$. □

Acknowledgements We would like to express our gratitude for the financial support from Shanghai Center of Mathematics during Sept. 2014-Jan. 2015 which makes the current co-work possible. This work is partially supported by NSFC (No. 11531001, No. 10701026, No. 11271077 and No. 11371317) and the Laboratory of Mathematics for Nonlinear Science, Fudan University.

References

[1] Bass, Richard F.; Kumagai, Takashi; *Laws of the iterated logarithm for the range of random walks in two and three dimensions*. Ann. Probab. **30** (2002), no. 3, 1369–1396. MR1920111

[2] Benjamini, I.; *Coarse Geometry and Randomness*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics **2100**, Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2013. MR3156647

[3] Benjamini, Itai; Kozma, Gady; Yadin, Ariel; Yehudayoff, Amir; *Entropy of random walk range*. Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat. **46** (2010), no. 4, 1080–1092. MR2744887

[4] Benjamini, I.; Gurel-Gurevich, O.; Lyons, R.; *Recurrence of random walk traces*. Ann. Probab. **35** (2007), 732–738. MR2308594

[5] Benjamini, Itai; Mller, Sebastian; *On the trace of branching random walks*. Groups Geom. Dyn. **6** (2012), no. 2, 231–247. MR2914859

[6] Derriennic, Yves; *Un théorème ergodique presque sous-additif. (French) [An almost subadditive ergodic theorem]* Ann. Probab. **11** (1983), no. 3, 669–677. MR0704553

[7] Durrett,R.; *Probability: Theory and Examples*. Fourth edition. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics, **31**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010. x+428 pp. ISBN: 978-0-521-76539-8. MR2722836

[8] Dvoretzky, A.; Erdös, P.; *Some problems on random walk in space*. Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1950, 353–367. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1951. MR0047272

[9] Erdös, P.; Taylor, S. J.; *Some problems concerning the structure of random walk paths*. Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung. **11** (1960), 137–162. MR0121870

[10] Erdös, P.; Taylor, S. J.; *Some intersection properties of random walk paths*. Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung. **11** (1960), 231–248. MR0126299

[11] Jain, N. C.; Pruitt, W. E.; *The range of transient random walk*. J. Anal. Math. **24** (1971), 369–393. MR0283890

[12] Jain, N. C.; Pruitt, W. E.; *The law of the iterated logarithm for the range of random walk*. Ann. Math. Statist. **43** (1972), 1692–1697. MR0345216

[13] Jain, N. C.; Pruitt, W. E.; *The range of random walk*. Proc. Sixth Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Probab. **3** (1972), 31–50. Univ. California Press, Berkeley. MR0410936

[14] Jain, N. C.; Pruitt, W. E.; *Further limit theorems for the range of random walk*. J. Anal. Math. **27** (1974), 94–117. MR0478361

[15] Kaĭmanovich, V. A.(2-LENI); Vershik, A. M.(2-LENI) *Random walks on discrete groups: boundary and entropy*. Ann. Probab. **11** (1983), no. 3, 457–490. MR0704539

[16] Kingman, J. F. C.; *Subadditive ergodic theory. With discussion by D. L. Burkholder, Daryl Daley, H. Kesten, P. Ney, Frank Spitzer and J. M. Hammersley, and a reply by the author.* Ann. Probability **1** (1973), 883–909. MR0356192

[17] Le Gall, J.-F.; *Propriétés d'intersection des marches aléatoires. I. Convergence vers le temps local d'intersection.* Comm. Math. Phys. **104** (1986), 471–507. MR0840748

[18] Liggett, Thomas M.; *An improved subadditive ergodic theorem.* Ann. Probab. **13** (1985), no. 4, 1279–1285. MR0806224

[19] Révész, P.; *Random Walk in Random and Non-Random Environments.* Second edition. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2005. MR2168855

[20] Ruzsa, I. Z.; Szkely, G. J.; *Intersections of traces of random walks with fixed sets.* Ann. Probab. **10** (1982), no. 1, 132–136. MR0637381

[21] Shannon, C. E.; *A mathematical theory of communication.* Bell System Tech. J. **27** (1948), 379–423, 623–656. MR0026286

[22] Shiraishi, Daisuke; *Exact value of the resistance exponent for four dimensional random walk trace.* Probab. Theory Related Fields **153** (2012), no. 1–2, 191–232. MR2925573

[23] Shiraishi, Daisuke; *Heat kernel for random walk trace on $\mathbb{Z}^3$ and $\mathbb{Z}^4$.* Ann. Inst. Henri Poincar Probab. Stat. **46** (2010), no. 4, 1001–1024. MR2744883

[24] Windisch, David; *Entropy of random walk range on uniformly transient and on uniformly recurrent graphs.* Electron. J. Probab. **15** (2010), no. 36, 1143–1160. MR2659760